DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 262 475 EA 018 025

TITLE Annual Promotion Demonstration Study. Final Report.
INSTITUTION District of Columbia Public Schools, Washington, DC. Div. of Quality Assurance.
PUB DATE Jul 84
NOTE 32p.; A version of this paper was presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, March 31-April 4, 1985).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Continuous Progress Plan; Elementary Education; Parent Attitudes; Program Evaluation; *School Schedules; Student Attitudes; *Student Promotion; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS District of Columbia Public Schools

ABSTRACT

Thirty-two elementary schools in the District of Columbia participated in a study comparing the effectiveness of the district's midyear student promotion program with that of an annual promotion program. Sixteen schools used each form of promotion. Third grade reading and mathematics scores in the experimental group did not differ significantly from those in the group retaining midyear promotions, nor were school promotion rates in June affected by the promotional system used. Experimental school principals and teachers who responded to a questionnaire indicated that changing the annual promotion did not greatly reduce bookkeeping or add to instructional time. Parents of students in both programs responded similarly to questions concerning the availability of information on their children's progress. Analysis of records indicated that students with instructional needs received similar amounts of assistance under both programs. A majority of experimental group students responding to a questionnaire preferred promotion twice a year, a plurality of parents agreed, and a majority of teachers and principals favored annual promotion. Although the study's outcomes proved inconclusive, the study did provide information on several factors involved in making a decision concerning promotional programs. Appendixes present background data, descriptions of research methods,, and specific findings. (PGD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED262475

District of Columbia Public Schools

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

David L. Hume

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ANNUAL PROMOTION DEMONSTRATION STUDY

FINAL REPORT

Prepared by
Division of Quality Assurance
July 1984

EA 018 025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
Background	1
Study Design	2
RESULTS	3
Achievement Rates	3
Promotion Rates	3
Recordkeeping	3
Instruction Time	4
Information Available to Parents	5
Assistance to Students With Instructional Needs	7
Student Referrals for Remediation	7
Skills Mastery	7
Promotion Preferences	8
Self-Image of Students	9
SUMMARY	11
DISCUSSION	11
APPENDIX A	14
Research Design	15
Collection of Data	16
Analyses	16
Experimental and Control Schools	17
APPENDIX B	18
Table 1	19
Table 2	20
Table 3	21
Table 4	24
Table 5	25
Table 6	26
Table 7	27
APPENDIX C	28
Percentile to Normal Curve Equivalent Conversion Table	29

ANNUAL PROMOTION DEMONSTRATION STUDY

INTRODUCTION

Background

In the fall of 1981, District of Columbia Public Schools' Superintendent Floretta McKenzie requested and received the assistance of the National Institute of Education and the University of the District of Columbia in conducting a comprehensive evaluation of the Comptency-Basei Curriculum and the Student Progress Plan (CBC/SPP). One of the recommendations for the continued and effective operation of CBC/SPP was the elimination of midyear (semester) promotion and in its place the establishment of an extensive remediation program at midyear or sooner for low-achieving students. The rationale of the evaluators was that

> The annual promotion gives teachers more time to address the developmental lag which some students experience at the beginning of the year, especially during the primary years. The concept that every child should be ready to move ahead at the exact time and date (midyear) defeats the whole purpose of the continuous progress curriculum.[1]

In the spring of 1983, the Educational Programs Committee of the Board of Education requested that the school system conduct a demonstration study in school year 1983-84 in a sample of schools instead of implementing annual promotion systemwide as had been proposed. In July 1983, the administration developed the Annual Promotion Demonstration Study to be implemented in sixteen elementary schools in the 1983-84 school year.

---

[1] Delores Greene, et al. "Results From the Review of the District of Columbia Public Schools Competency Based Curriculum and Student Progress Plan". April, 1982.

Study Design

The plan for the implementation of annual promotion in the demonstration schools was developed by the Office of Instruction. The research design to measure the effects of annual promotion was developed by the Division of Quality Assurance. Sixteen schools in which annual promotion was to be implemented (experimental) and an equal number of schools retaining semester promotion (control) were randomly selected for a total of 32 schools.

The research, in the collection and the analyses of data across regions, was designed to address five basic questions:

1. To what extent are school achievement rates affected by the type of promotion, annual vs. semester?

2. To what extent are school retention rates in June 1984 affected by the type of promotion, annual vs. semester?

3. Does the type of promotion have a differential effect on the availability of information that is given to the parents of students?

4. Does the type of promotion have a differential effect on the amount of assistance provided to students with instructional needs?

5. Does annual promotion substantially reduce recordkeeping requirements to the degree that more instructional time is available to students?

The sources of data collected and the results of each question follow in the next section. A listing of participating schools, their distribution by region and Chapter 1 status, and a description of the statistical design are contained in Appendix A.

RESULTS

Interviews of experimental school principals were conducted by DQA staff in December and January. Results indicated that for the most part, the return to annual promotion had been uniformly implemented by October 1984 without difficulty or distress on the part of principals, teachers, parents, and students. Results as follows are presented for each research question.

TO WHAT EXTENT ARE SCHOOL ACHIEVEMENT RATES AFFECTED BY THE TYPES OF PROMOTION, ANNUAL vs. SEMESTER?

Third-grade experimental group and control group mean scores were compared in both reading and mathematics, as measured by the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS), administered in May 1984. There was no statistically significant difference in either reading or mathematics achievement of experimental and control groups (Appendix B, Table 1).

TO WHAT EXTENT ARE SCHOOL PROMOTION RATES IN JUNE 1984 AFFECTED BY THE TYPES OF PROMOTION, ANNUAL vs. SEMESTER?

Promotion rate data calculated on an annual basis from September 1983 to June 1984 for the experimental and control group schools were obtained from items 4 and 5 of the Evaluation System Data Collection Form 301. There was no statistically significant difference in promotion rate of experimental and control group schools at any grade level (1-6) or for total grades (Appendix B, Table 2).

DOES ANNUAL PROMOTION SUBSTANTIALLY REDUCE RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS TO THE DEGREE THAT MORE INSTRUCTIONAL TIME IS AVAILABLE TO STUDENTS?

At the end of the first semester, a questionnaire was sent to the principals and teachers of the 16 experimental schools in the Annual Promotion Demonstration Study with a request that they be returned by February 29, 1984.

The purpose of the questionnaire was to solicit their opinions regarding recordkeeping, instruction time, skills mastery, self-image of students, student referrals for remediation, and the amount of student progress information available to parents. Response rates varied among the questions, but generally about 64% of the principals, 39% of the primary teachers, and 45% of the intermediate teachers responded to the questionnaire. Both groups of teachers had a much lower response rate than did the principals, but the response rate of all three groups was considerably lower than that generally recognized as acceptable for drawing strong conclusions. Responses to the questionnaire are presented in Table 3, Appendix B.

In response to Question 1, "To what extent did the elimination of semester promotion affect the amount of recordkeeping?", over half of the primary teachers who responded (56.3%) and 47.7% of the intermediate teachers who responded indicated that there was no change in the amount of recordkeeping with annual promotion. Over half of the principals who responded and about one-third of the primary and intermediate teachers who responded indicated that there was a slight reduction in recordkeeping.

Question 2 asked, "Did the elimination of semester promotion affect the amount of time available for instruction?" Of those who responded, about 75% of intermediate teachers and a little less than 75% of principals and primary teachers indicated that the same amount of time was available for instruction under annual promotion as under semester promotion. Most of the remainder responded that more time was available for instruction under annual promotion.

To determine the extent to which the above responses were influenced by the maintainence of a dual set of records of grade placement of students, one set with "A, B, T" designations and another set without, teachers and princials were asked specifically whether or not they had kept dual records (Question 6). Most answered that they had not.

DOES THE TYPE OF PROMOTION HAVE A DIFFERENTIAL EFFECT ON THE AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION GIVEN TO THE PARENTS OF STUDENTS?

In May 1984 a questionnaire on a postage-paid postcard was sent to the parents of all students in grades 1-6 of the experimental and control group schools. A total of 626 responses (11%) were received from the parents of experimental school children, and 615 (12%) were received from control school parents. The numerical data are presented in Appendix B, Table 4. There was no statistically significant difference between the responses of parents from the two groups of schools on any of the questions. Since the response rate was low, this information was supplemented with interviews of presidents of parent organizations in experimental schools.

The majority of parents of primary students who responded to the question, "Did you receive sufficient information this year about your child's progress in school?", indicated that they had received sufficient information, 82.2% and 82.6% of experimental and control schools, respectively. At the intermediate level, 84.8% experimental and 82.3% control school parents held a similar view.

Comparing responses of parents of primary children, 42.9% of experimental school parents indicated that they had received more information this year, 41.2% said that they had received the same amount of information, and 15.9% reported that they received less information. Figures for the control group parents were 40.3%, 47.6%, and 12.1%, respectively.

At the intermediate level, 39.9% of experimental school parents who answered this question stated that they had received more information this year, 49.1% said that they had received the same amount of information, and 11.0% responded that they had received less information. Figures for the control group parents were 38.2%, 43.8%, and 18.0%, respectively.

The kinds of information most wanted by both experimental and control school parents who responded are:

1. Both more written and more frequent reports of progress
2. Information as to how parents can help their children with school work
3. Grades (and levels) in reading and math four times a year instead of 2
4. Notification of child's possible failure before the end of the year
5. More parent-teacher conferences.

On a parallel question to principals and teachers in experimental schools at midyear (Table 3, Question 8 in Appendix B), 80.0% of the principals, 85.4% of the primary teachers, and 72.7% of the intermediate teachers who responded said "Yes", that parents received as much information about student progress under annual promotion as they did under semester promotion. Twenty percent of the principals, 14.6% of the primary teachers, and 27.3% of the intermediate teachers who answered the question said "No", that parents did not receive as much information about student progress under annual promotion.

Fourteen of the 16 PTA presidents from the experimental schools were interviewed by telephone at the end of June. They were asked the same questions that were included in the Parent Questionnaire.

Most responded that they had received sufficient information and the amount was equal to or greater than last year. They felt that their children had made greater or the same progress under annual promotion compared to last year. Only two of the fourteen PTA presidents interviewed preferred semester promotion. Ten preferred annual, and two stated that it did not matter.

DOES THE TYPE OF PROMOTION HAVE A DIFFERENTIAL EFFECT ON THE AMOUNT OF ASSISTANCE PROVIDED TO STUDENTS WITH INSTRUCTIONAL NEEDS?

The number of days of assistance provided to students with instructional needs was also obtained from ES Form 301. The average number of days of assistance received was compared between experimental and control schools for each grade level and for all grades. The results shown in Appendix B, Table 5, indicate that there was no statistically significant difference in the amount of assistance given to students in the two groups of schools except for grade 1. The average number of days of assistance given in grade 1 in control schools was 3.5 in reading and in mathematics compared to 2.5 and 1.6 in reading and mathematics, respectively, in the experimental schools. The averages across all grades were 2.9 for reading and 2.4 for mathematics in experimental schools and 3.0 and 2.7, respectively, in the control schools.

In the questionnaire to experimental school principals and teachers at midyear, they were asked, "Did the elimination of semester promotion influence the number of students referred for remediation?" Most of those who responded (80.0% of principals, 80.9% of primary teachers, and 70.5% of intermediate teachers) indicated that there was no change in the number of students referred for remediation with the elimination of semester promotion. Twenty percent of the principals, 17.0% of the primary teachers, and 22.7% of the intermediate teachers who responded indicated that there were fewer student referrals for remediation with the elimination of semester promotion (Table 3, Question 7).

In response to the question, "How did the elimination of midyear promotion affect the number of skills mastered by most of the students at the end of the first semester?", about 90% of the principals and intermediate teachers and about 75% of the primary teachers who responded indicated that

about the same number of skills were mastered at the end of the first semester under annual promotion as were usually mastered with semester promotion. About one-fourth of the primary teachers who responded indicated that more skills were mastered under annual promotion (Table 3, Question 3).

ATTITUDES TOWARDS ANNUAL PROMOTION AND THE IMPACT ON THE SELF-IMAGE OF STUDENTS

In addition to developing questionnaire items to answer the specific research questions stated in the original design, questions were included in questionnaires to staff and parents (previously described) and to students of experimental schools to determine their attitude toward annual promotion.

To measure the attitudes of students toward midyear promotion in the 16 experimental schools, two evaluators administered a six-item questionnaire to the students in four 3rd, four 4th, four 5th, and four 6th grades in the experimental schools. Each of the four grade levels was randomly assigned to four experimental schools. A total of 757 students (84% of the enrollment in the respective schools and grades) answered the questionnaire.

The responses of the students to the questionnaire items are summarized by grade and total in Appendix B, Table 6. First, in looking at the summary responses of the total group, the majority responses are evident as follows:

- 62% of the 757 students did not like the elimination of midyear promotion.
- 71% preferred twice-a-year promotion.
- 62% had never been kept back in a grade.
- 64% were never in an AT or BT grade.
- For those students who had been in an AT or BT grade, 51% did not like being there.

- 41% of the students answered that it did not matter to them, in regard to their learning better, which type of promotion was used - January and June or June alone. January and June promotion ran a close second at 37%. Only 18% indicated they preferred promotion once a year in June.

There is a discrepancy of ten percentage points between the first and second "bullets" above, even though they seemingly are measuring the same preference. This discrepancy most probably results from the confusing wording of the first questionnaire item.

Parents in both control and experimental schools and staff in experimental schools were asked their preference for annual or semester promotion. With the exception of parents of primary children in experimental schools, the largest percentage of parents who responded preferred promotion in January and June (Appendix B, Table 3). It should be noted however, that these percentages were all less than a majority, and the percent of those favoring semester promotion over annual promotion did not exceed 10 percentage points. Although the response of teachers and principals was exceedingly small as shown in Appendix B, Table 7, the majority stated a preference for annual promotion.

The explanations of parents from experimental schools regarding their preference for semester or annual promotion were about equal in number and extremely diverse. Staff preferences for annual promotion were clustered around (a) children having more time to master skills, (b) less paperwork, and (c) more time to teach.

On the questionnaire administered to experimental schools staff at midyear, they were asked to assess the impact of the type of promotion on the self-image of students (Table 3, Questions 5 and 6). Of those who responded, 60% of the principals and close to 60% of the primary and intermediate teachers

indicated that there was no change in the self-image of students who were performing below grade level at the end of the first semester compared with that of similar students at the same time last year. Forty percent of the principals and over one-third of the primary and intermediate teachers who responded indicated that the self-image and attitude were more positive.

Of those who responded regarding students at or above grade level, 90% of principals and a little more than 80% of primary and intermediate teachers indicated that there was no change in the self-image and attitude of students at the end of the first semester with annual promotion compared with that of similar students at the same time last year. A little over 17% of primary teachers and 13% of intermediate teachers indicated that the self-image and attitude were more positive.

SUMMARY

The data collected for this study suggest that after one year's experience, the schedule of promotion, annual vs semester, did not affect outcome measures: achievement, promotion, paperwork or information sent to parents of students regarding their instructional progress. There were differences in the attitude of the participants: Staff, although not representative of experimental schools, who responded, prefer annual promotion. A slight majority of students, and the largest percentage of parents (not a majority) prefer semester promotion.

DCPS administrators have stated, and the results of this study confirm, that the type of promotion should not produce different results as long as the stated CBC/SPP program principles are followed. It would seem that the difference in the effectiveness of the particular promotion schedule is in the perception of those affected and that none of the participants has indicated overwhelming allegiance to either plan.

DISCUSSION

If the study outcomes do not clearly dictate a course of action, what other factors can be considered in making the decision? It does seem that the study yields information responsive to major concerns most often raised about CBC/SPP. Those concerns are stated below.

(1) To what extent does the complexity of the system contribute to superior results? Semester promotion as presently interperted yields 24 grade levels - difficult to recall in proper sequence for all but the most closely involved. It is interesting to note that although many parents in control schools advocated the semester plan, few used the grade letter designations. The study data suggest that simplifying the system did not lessen the positive effects of the instructional program. In

addition, the system seems to work more often for holding students back when they need to be retained then for moving them ahead when they need to advance. None of the current implementation manuals speaks to advancement.

(2) Must a student be retained or labeled a "failure" to get extra help? The data collected for this study suggest that they do not. It has been pointed out that semester promotion means that a student loses no more than a half year at a time if he/she does not pass. Does that necessarily mean a student must be retained for an entire year under annual promotion? Objections to semester promotion most often cited by respondents were the increased failure rate and the shortened instructional time constraint resulting in a terminal evaluation. While self-concept data were not collected as part of this study, our own experience and sensibilities tell us that students who are retained are affected adversely. CBC was designed as an instructional program which allows students to progress at their own rate of learning and thereby reduce the occurence of failure.

(3) Does annual promotion lessen accountability? Parents, school administrators, Board members, and the community require regular reports to monitor the educational progress of students and the effectiveness of the instructional program. The parents of children in both experimental and control schools indicated that they received sufficient information about the instructional progress of their children and that the amount of information received was either greater than or the same as last year. Therefore, the availabilty of information is not dependent upon promotion decisions at midyear. Student progress information sytemwide can be determined with data that are collected on ES Forms 303 and 301, completed at the end of the first and second semester for each student. The level of instruction in both reading and mathematics is indicated on the form. By comparing instructional levels in January and June the amount of progress can be determined for an individual student, a school, or systemwide.

(4) What changes are necessary to return to annual promotion? Based upon the data collected for this study, no involved procedures are necessary other than (a) inform staff and parents of the change but emphasize that the same records of instructional progress will be maintained and reported to parents. Instead of midyear promotion/retention reports, the Division of Quality Assurance will prepare instructional progress reports for

each grade by school, by region, and systemwide, and (b) discontinue the use of letter designations on grade placement records. This would not affect the numerical placement of students except those in 6B in September 1984. These students were excluded from the study. They would either remain in 6th grade for the entire year or be permitted to enter junior high school the second semester.

(5) What changes will be necessary to return 1983-84 experimental schools to semester promotion?
Semester grade placement will have to be determined based upon instructional level. Just as in annual grade placement above, the numerical designations would not be affected.

APPENDIX A

Under an annual promotion policy, the standards, monitoring, reporting to parents and additional assistance would not be diminished. "The baby is not being thrown out with the bath water." Much of SPP has been proven successful. We need now to refine the process, keeping the elements that are working well and removing the aspects which are not beneficial to students' prospects for academic success.

Based on this rationale and the approval of the Board of Education given on July 20, 1983, the Superintendent will implement an Annual Promotion Demonstration Study in sixteen (16) schools during 1983-1984.

DESCRIPTION OF THE RESEARCH DESIGN

Number of Schools Involved: 32 schools, (16 control and 16 experimental)

Unit of Analysis: School

Selection of Participating Schools:

A stratified random sampling technique will be used to select sixteen experimental schools and sixteen comparable schools as control schools. AIMS schools will be excluded.

Schools from each of the four regions will be included both as experimental and control. Chapter 1 and non-Chapter 1 schools will also be included in both groups.

Treatment:

Students in the sixteen experimental schools will continue in SPP for school year 1983-84 with these changes: (1) grade level designations will be one through six (1-6); and (2) promotion will be on an annual basis (June, 1984).

Students in the sixteen control schools will continue in SPP for school year 1983-84 without any changes. Students who were promoted to 6BT or 6B in June 1983 will not be included in this study because of their anticipated placement in grade seven in February 1984.

Collection of Data:

Data will be collected by DQA from the following sources:

Variable		Source
Achievement, Spring	1984	Citywide test results (3rd grade)
Retention/Promotion,	Sept. 1983 and June 1984	Evaluation System (SPP)
Student Assistance		Evaluation System (SPP)
Parental Attitude		Questionnaire
Staff Opinion		Questionnaire (experimental)
Resources		Questionnaire (principal)

Analyses:

Analyses will be across regions. The five basic questions to be addressed are as follows:

(1) To what extent are school achievement-rates affected by the types of promotion, annual vs. semester? The dependent measure will be the median school percentile achievement levels for 3rd grade students in reading and mathematics on the citywide norm-reference test administered in May 1984. Analysis of variance will be used to compare the means of achievement rates.

(2) To what extent are school retention rates in June 1984 affected by the type of promotion, annual vs. semester? The school retention rate will be the ratio of school retention to the schools' enrollment in grades 1 - 6, 1984. Analysis of variance will be used second semester 1984 to compare the retention rates.

(3) Does the type of promotion have a differential effect on the amount of availability of students' progress information that is given to the parents? Chi-square will be used to compare the relationship between parental reception of information and type of promotion for each school.

(4) Does the type of promotion have a differential effect on the amount of assistance provided to students with instructional needs? Chi-square will be used to compare the relationships between type of promotion policy and amount of help for each school.

(5) Does annual promotion substantially reduce recordkeeping requirements to the degree that more instructional time is available to students? A descriptive analysis of questionnaire responses from staff in experimental schools will be done.

Sample Schools:

Experimental	Control
1. Bunker Hill (Region C. Non-Chapter 1)	1. Adams (Region C, Non-Chapter 1)
2. Burrville (Region D, Non-Chapter 1)	2. Bancroft (Region C, Chapter 1)
3. Key (Region B, Non-Chapter 1)	3. Brent (Region D, Non-Chapter 1)
4. Langdon (Region C, Chapter 1)	4. Carver (Region D, Chapter 1)
5. Orr (Region D, Non-Chapter 1)	5. Cleveland (Region C, Chapter 1)
6. Payne (Region D, Chapter 1)	6. Davis (Region D, Non-Chapter 1)
7. Rudolph (Region B, Non-Chapter 1)	7. Green (Region A, Chapter 1)
8. Shadd (Region D, Chapter 1)	8. Harrison (Region C, Chapter 1)
9. Slater-Langston (Region C, Chapter 1)	9. Janney (Region B, Non-Chapter 1)
10. Stanton (Region D, Chapter 1)	10. Malcolm X (Region A, Chapter 1)
11. Truesdell (Region B, Chapter 1)	11. Murch (Region B, Non-Chapter 1)
12. Turner (Region A, Chapter 1)	12. Patterson (Region A, Chapter 1)
13. Walker-Jones (Region A, Chapter 1)	13. Raymond (Region B, Chapter 1)
14. Washington Highlands(Region A, Chapter 1)	14. Reed, Marie (Region C, Chapter 1)
15. West (Region B, Non-Chapter 1)	15. Richardson (Region D, Chapter 1)
16. Wilkinson (Region A, Chapter 1)	16. Webb (Region C, Chapter 1)

Number of Schools by Chapter 1 Status

	Experimental	Control	Total
Chapter 1	10	11	21
Non-Chapter 1	6	5	11
	16	16	32

Number of Schools by Regions

Region A	4	3	7
Region B	4	3	7
Region C	3	6	9
Region D	5	4	9
	16	16	32

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX B

Table 1 to Table 7

Table 1

AVERAGE READING AND MATHEMATICS NCE[1] SCORES OF THIRD GRADE STUDENTS IN CONTROL AND EXPERIMENTAL SCHOOLS ON THE CTBS IN MAY 1984

	Experimental	Control	t
Reading	56.3	57.3	.28 NS
Mathematics	56.4	57.9	.47 NS

NS = Not Statistically Significant at .05 level

1 Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE's) scores are derived from the conversion of the percentile scale into an equal interval scale which has the same mean (50) and approximately the same range as the percentile scale. Being an equal interval scale, NCE scores can be divided, multiplied, added and subtracted, whereas percentile and grade equivalent scores should not be. For the convenience of the reader, a percentile/NCE conversion table is included in Appendix C.

Table 2

PROMOTION RATES IN EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL SCHOOLS
SCHOOL YEAR 1983-84[1]

Grade Level	Schools' Promotion Rates in Percents		
	Experimental	Control	t
1	80.1	85.1	-1.13 NS
2	87.6	85.4	0.57 NS
3	89.2	90.3	-0.33 NS
4	94.9	91.6	1.31 NS
5	95.3	91.3	1.25 NS
6	98.9	94.8	1.49 NS
1-6	90.3	89.1	0.51 NS

NS = Not statistically significant at .05 level

[1] Calculated on an annual basis from September 1983 to June 1984.

Source: Evaluation System Reading and Mathematics Program Data Collection Form #301

Table 3

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES OF PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS IN EXPERIMENTAL SCHOOLS REGARDING SEMESTER AND ANNUAL PROMOTION: FEBRUARY 1984

Question 1: To what extent did the elimination of semester promotion affect the amount of recordkeeping?

Response	Respondents		
	Principals (N=11)	Primary Teachers (N=48)	Intermediate Teachers (N=44)
Great reduction in recordkeeping	0.0%	4.2%	9.1%
Slight reduction in recordkeeping	54.5%	31.3%	38.6%
No change in recordkeeping	45.5%	56.3%	47.7%
Slight increase in recordkeeping	0.0%	6.3%	2.3%
Great increase in recordkeeping	0.0%	2.1%	2.3%

Question 2: Did the elimination of semester promotion affect the amount of time available for instruction?

Response	Respondents		
	Principals (N=11)	Primary Teachers (N=47)	Intermediate Teachers (N=45)
Less time was availale for instruction.	0.0%	0.0%	6.7%
The same amount of time was available for instruction.	72.7%	72.3%	75.6%
More time was available for instruction.	27.3%	27.7%	17.8%

Table 3 (continued)

Question 3: How did the elimination of midyear promotion affect the number of skills mastered by most of the students at the end of the first semester?

Response	Respondents		
	Principals (N=11)	Primary Teachers (N=47)	Intermediate Teachers (N=45)
Fewer skills were mastered.	0.0%	2.1%	4.4%
About the same number of skills were mastered.	90.9%	74.5%	86.7%
More skills were mastered.	9.1%	23.4%	8.9%

Question 4: How did the self-image and attitude of students who were performing below grade level at the end of the first semester compare with that of similar students at the same time last year?

Response	Respondents		
	Principals (N=10)	Primary Teachers (N=46)	Intermediate Teachers (N=44)
Less positive	0.0%	6.5%	4.5%
No change	60.0%	58.7%	59.1%
More postive	40.0%	34.8%	36.4%

Question 5: How did the self-image and attitude of students who were performing at or above grade level at the end of the first semester compare with that of similar students at the same time last year?

Response	Respondents		
	Principals (N=10)	Primary Teachers (N=46)	Intermediate Teachers (N=45)
Less positive	0.0%	2.2%	4.4%
No change	90.0%	80.4%	82.2%
More positive	10.0%	17.4%	13.3%

Table 3 (continued)

Question 6: Did you keep a dual set of records of grade placement of students, one with "A's", "B's", and "I's" and one set without those designations?

Response	Respondents		
	Principals (N= 9)	Primary Teachers (N=44)	Intermediate Teachers (N=43)
Yes	33.3%	13.6%	18.6%
No	66.7%	86.4%	81.4%

Question 7: Did the elimination of semester promotion influence the number of students referred for remediation?

Response	Respondents		
	Principals (N=10)	Primary Teachers (N=47)	Intermediate Teachers (N=44)
Fewer referrals	20.0%	17.0%	22.7%
No change	80.0%	80.9%	70.5%
More referrals	0.0%	2.1%	6.8%

Question 8: Did parents receive as much information about student progress under annual promotion as they did under semester promotion?

Response	Respondents		
	Principals (N=10)	Primary Teachers (N=48)	Intermediate Teachers (N=44)
Yes	80.0%	85.4%	72.7%
No	20.0%	14.6%	27.3%

Table 4

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES OF PARENTS IN EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL SCHOOLS REGARDING SEMESTER AND ANNUAL PROMOTION - MAY 1984

Question 1: Did you receive sufficient information this year about your child's progress in school?

Responses	Respondents							
	Primary				Intermediate			
	Experimental		Control		Experimental		Control	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	277	82.2	284	82.6	212	84.8	205	82.3
No	60	17.8	60	17.4	38	15.2	44	17.7

Question 3: How did the quantity of information you received this year about your child's progress compare with that received last year?

Responses	Respondents							
	Primary				Intermediate			
	Experimental		Control		Experimental		Control	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
More	146	42.9	133	40.3	105	39.9	95	38.2
Same	140	41.2	157	47.6	129	49.1	109	43.8
Less	54	15.9	40	12.1	29	11.0	45	18.0

Question 4: Which promotion schedule do your prefer?

Responses	Respondents							
	Primary				Intermediate			
	Experimental		Control		Experimental		Control	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
January & June (Twice a year)	134	39.2	156	45.7	112	44.3	113	44.7
June Only (Once a year)	142	41.5	126	37.0	89	35.2	89	35.2
Does Not Matter	66	19.3	59	17.3	52	20.5	51	20.1

Table 5

AVERAGE NUMBER OF DAYS OF ASSISTANCE PROVIDED BY EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL SCHOOLS TO STUDENTS WITH INSTRUCTIONAL NEEDS[1] IN READING AND MATHEMATICS SECOND SEMESTER, 1983-84

Grade Level	READING			MATHEMATICS		
	Experimental	Control	t	Experimental	Control	t
1	2.5	3.5	-2.50*	1.6	3.5	-4.17*
2	2.8	2.4	0.88 NS	2.1	2.2	-0.26 NS
3	3.0	3.3	-0.61 NS	2.6	3.0	-0.91 NS
4	3.1	3.1	0.07 NS	2.9	2.4	0.98 NS
5	3.2	3.2	0.05 NS	2.3	3.0	-1.34 NS
6	3.4	3.5	-0.29 NS	2.9	2.8	0.05 NS
1-6	2.9	3.0	-0.50 NS	2.4	2.7	-0.98 NS

1 Instructional level in reading and/or mathematics is below the appropriate level for the grade placement.

Source: Evaluation System Reading and Mathematics Program Data Collection Form #301

*Significant at .05

NS = Not statistically significant

TABLE 6

ATTITUDES OF STUDENTS IN THIRD THROUGH SIXTH GRADES IN EXPERIMENTAL SCHOOLS TOWARD MIDYEAR PROMOTION

QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS	Total N=757	Grade 3 N=239	Grade 4 N=195	Grade 5 N=170	Grade 6 N=153
1. Did you like not having promotion in January 1984?					
Yes	38%	44%	32%	41%	31%
No	62%	55%	67%	59%	68%
No Response	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%
2. Would you rather have promotion twice a year in January and June like last year?					
Yes	71%	67%	75%	69%	74%
No	28%	31%	25%	31%	26%
No Response	1%	2%	0%	0%	0%
3. Have you ever been kept back in a grade?					
Yes	37%	30%	51%	39%	30%
No	62%	70%	49%	60%	70%
No Response	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%
4. Were you ever in an AT or BT grade?					
Yes	35%	36%	39%	35%	28%
No	64%	63%	59%	65%	71%
No Response	2%	2%	3%	0%	1%
5. If your answer to 4 was "Yes", did you like being in an AT or BT grade?					
Yes	44%	58%	45%	35%	28%
No	51%	34%	48%	65%	67%
No Response	5%	8%	7%	0%	5%
6. Do you think that you learn better with promotion in:					
January and June	37%	38%	34%	39%	37%
June only	21%	18%	22%	23%	21%
Does not matter	41%	41%	44%	38%	42%
No Response	1%	3%	1%	0%	0%

Table 7

PROMOTION PREFERENCES OF PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS
IN EXPERIMENTAL SCHOOLS, JUNE 1984

	Principals	Primary Teachers	Intermediate Teachers
Annual	6	39	24
Semester	2		2
Does Not Matter		1	1

APPENDIX C

Percentile to Normal Curve Equivalent Conversion Table

NCE	Percentile	NCE	Percentile	NCE	Percentile	NCE	Percentile
1	1.0	26	36.5	51	50.5	76	64.9
2	6.7	27	37.1	52	51.1	77	65.6
3	10.4	28	37.7	53	51.6	78	66.3
4	13.1	29	38.3	54	52.1	79	67.0
5	15.4	30	39.0	55	52.6	80	67.7
6	17.3	31	39.6	56	53.2	81	68.5
7	18.9	32	40.1	57	53.7	82	69.3
8	20.4	33	40.7	58	54.2	83	70.1
9	21.8	34	41.3	59	54.8	84	70.9
10	23.0	35	41.9	60	55.3	85	71.8
11	24.2	36	42.5	61	55.9	86	72.8
12	25.3	37	43.0	62	56.4	87	73.7
13	26.3	38	43.6	63	57.0	88	74.7
14	27.2	39	44.1	64	57.5	89	75.8
15	28.2	40	44.7	65	58.1	90	77.0
16	29.1	41	45.2	66	58.7	91	78.2
17	29.9	42	45.8	67	59.3	92	79.6
18	30.7	43	46.3	68	59.9	93	81.1
19	31.5	44	46.8	69	60.4	94	82.7
20	32.3	45	47.4	70	61.0	95	84.6
21	33.0	46	47.9	71	61.7	96	86.9
22	33.7	47	48.4	72	62.3	97	89.6
23	34.4	48	48.9	73	62.9	98	93.3
24	35.1	49	49.5	74	63.5	99	99.0
25	35.8	50	50.0	75	64.2		